

क्रमांक 2027-ज(II)-77/662.—पूर्वी पंजाब युद्ध पुरस्कार अधिनियम, 1948 (जैसा कि उसे हरियाणा राज्य में अपनाया गया है और उस में आज तक संशोधन किया गया है) की धारा 2(ए) (1ए) तथा 3(1ए) के अनुसार सौंपे गये अधिका का प्रयोग करते हुए हरियाणा के राज्यपाल निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को वार्षिक कीमत वाली युद्ध जागीर उनके सामने दी ग. फसल तथा राशि एवं सन्द में दी गई शर्तों के अनुसार सहर्ष प्रदान करते हैं :—

क्रमांक	जिला	जागीर पाने वाले का नाम	गांव व पत्ता	तहसील	फसल/वर्ष जब से जागीर दी गई	वार्षिक राशि
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	जोन्द	श्री राम रूप, पुत्र श्री नन्हू राम	निजंन	जोन्द	रबी, 1974 से	रु० 150
2	"	श्री भरत सिंह, पुत्र श्री वारू राम	कालवा	सक्कीदों	खरीफ, 1965 से	150

क्रमांक 2089-ज(I)-77/666.—पूर्वी पंजाब युद्ध पुरस्कार अधिनियम, 1948 (जैसा कि उसे हरियाणा राज्य में अपनाया गया है और उसमें आज तक संशोधन किया गया है) की धारा 2(ए) (1) तथा 3(1) के अनुसार सौंपे गये अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए हरियाणा के राज्यपाल श्री झुन्डा सिंह, पुत्र श्री जीवन सिंह, गांव यारी, तहसील थानेसर, जिला कुरुक्षेत्र, को रबी, 1973 से 150 रुपये वार्षिक कीमत वाली युद्ध जागीर सन्द में दी गई शर्तों के अनुसार सहर्ष प्रदान करते हैं।

आई. एम. खुंगर,

अवर सचिव, हरियाणा सरकार,
राजस्व विभाग।

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT
BUILDINGS AND ROADS

The 30th December, 1977

No. S.E./PWD/B&R Branch/Ambala/1034.—In pursuance of provisions of section 48 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, and all other powers enabling him in this behalf, the Governor of Haryana is pleased to withdraw from Acquisition the land with respect to which a notification under section 4 of the said Act was issued, — vide S.E. Ambala/Circle/PWD/B&R/447/R, dated 26th October, 1971 for construction of a road from Priupala in Judda Jattan village Tehi Jattan in Ambala District and was published in *Haryana Govt. Gazette*, dated 14th December, 1971, page No. 1639.

District	Tehsil	Locality	Area in Acres	Remarks
Ambala	Jagadhri	Tehi Jattan	0.28 Sq. miles	As per demarcation at site

No. S.E./PWD/B&R/Ambala/542.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 48 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 and all other powers enabling him in this behalf the Governor of Haryana is pleased to withdraw from Acquisition the land with respect to which a notification under section 6 of the said Act was issued, — vide S.E. Ambala Circle/PWD/B&R/507, dated 18th September, 1974 for constructing a road from Piruwala to Judda Jattan via Tehi Jattan in Ambala District and was published in *Haryana Government Gazette*, dated 8th October, 1974.

District	Tehsil	Locality	Area in Acres	Rectangle	Killa No.
Ambala	Jagadhri	Tehi Jattan	1.66	4	16/1, 16/2, 25/1, 25/2
				11	5/1, 5/2, 5/3, 6/1, 6/2, 6/3, 15/1, 15/2, 16/1, 16/2, 25/1, 25/2, 25/3
				13	25/1, 25/2
				24	5/1, 5/2, 5/3, 18, 19, 20, 18, 31, 22, 31, 38, 40, 23
				14	19, 20/2, 21/1

(Sd.)

Superintending Engineer,
Ambala Circle PWD/B&R Branch,
Ambala Cantt.

CORRIGENDUM

The 6th January, 1978

No. S. E. Rohtak Circle PWD B & R Br. 28RA/IV/475.—Corrigendum Notification U/S IV the work of Constg. Nangal Chaudhry-Budhwal Road to Niamatpur Maround in Mohindergarh District,—vide Notification No. S. E. PWD B and R Br. Rohtak No. 365, dated 24th October, 1975 as published in Haryana Government Gazette on 11th November, 1975 at page No. 1511 to 1513.

The following correction addition may please be read for the figures mentioned below:—

Sr. No.	Name of village	Wrong Khasra No. published in the Gazette under section 4 at page No. 1511 to 1513	Correct No. of Khasra which are to be published
1.	Nangal Chaudhry		Mustil No. 38 Kila No. 19, 20. Mustil No. 43 Kila No. 10/1, 10/2, 5/1, 5/2, 5/3,
2.	Nain	Mustil No. 98 Mustil No. 112	Mustil No. 93 Mustil No. 122 Mustil No. 93, Kila No. 25. Mustil No. 112 Kila No. 3/1, 3/2, 4, 5, 6/1, 6/2 Mustil No. 112 Kila No. 7, 15. Mustil No. 121 Kila No. 4/1, 4/3, 5/1, 5/2, 6/1, Mustil No 122, Kila No. 1

Sr. No.	Name of village	Wrong Khasra No. published in the Gazette under section 4 at page No. 1511 to 1513	Correct No. of Khasra which are to be published
3.	Kalba		Mustil No. 24 Kila No. 9/1, Khasra No. 68.
4.	Asrawas		M-3. Kila No. 16 M-5 Kila No. 22/3.
5.	Niamatpur Maround		M-20 Kila No. 11/2, 13, 16/1, 16/2, 17. Khasra No. 381-391.
		Mustil No. 44 Kila No. 1 to 24	

(Sd.)

Superintending Engineer,
Rohtak Circle, P. W. D. B and R.

IRRIGATION DEPARTMENT

The 6th January, 1978.

No. 395.—Whereas it appears to the Governor of Haryana that land specified below is needed by the Government, at public expense, for a public purpose, namely, for constructing Dhani Dhola Minor from R.D. 0 to tail R.D. 8,000 taking off at R.D. 30,560 Right Loharu Distributary in village Dhani Dhola Ahmadwas and Gagarwas in tehsil Loharu, district Bhiwani, it is hereby notified that the land in the locality specified below is to be required for the above purpose.

This notification is made under the provisions of section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, for the information of all to whom it may concern.

In exercise of the powers conferred by the aforesaid section, the Governor of Haryana hereby authorises the officers of Irrigation Department for the time being engaged in the undertaking along with their servants, workmen etc., to enter upon any survey land in the locality and do all other acts required or permitted by the section.

Further whereas the Governor of Haryana is satisfied the land is required for constructing Dhani Dhola minor from R.D. 0 to tail R.D. 8,000 which is of very urgent importance within the meaning of clause (c) of sub-section (2) of section 17 of the said Act and whereas the Governor of Haryana is of the opinion that the provision of sub-section (2) of the said section are thus applicable, it is hereby directed under sub-section (4) of section 17 of the said Act, and that of the provisions of section 5A of the said Act shall not apply in regard to this acquisition.

SPECIFICATIONS

District	Tehsil	Village	Area in acres	Hadbast No.	Boundary
					A strip of land measuring 8,000 feet in varying in width in passing through khasra numbers as below :—
Bhiwani	Loharu	Dhani-Shola	2.514	60	<div><div>33</div><div>34</div><div>667711</div><div>4, 5, 1, 2, 1, 2, 1, 2, 10</div></div>

District	Tehsil	Village	Area in Acres	Hadbart No.	Boundary
Bhiwani	Loharu	Dhani Dhola— concl'd	2.514— concl'd	60— concl'd	16 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 16 13 24 24 25 25 23, —, —, —, —, — 1 2 1 2 4 65, 67 3, 4, 6, 7, 8
Bhiwani	Loharu	Ahmadwas	5.563	56	97 1, 9, 10, 11, 12, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 98 89 88 5, 6, —, 21, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 88 87 15, 16, 17, 24, 25, 1 1 —, —, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 1 2 87 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 86 179 6 6 5, —, — 1d 2 105 94 1, 2, 3, 4, 21, 22, 23, 24 95 11 11 17 17 —, —, 12, —, —, 18, 19, 20, 23, 24, 25 1 2 1 2 104 96 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 96 422 9, 10, 12, 11 18 18 —, —, —, 19 2 1 2 And generally lying in the direction from south- east to north-west as demarcated at site and as shown on the plan
Bhiwani	Loharu	Gagarwas	5.20	58	

(Sd.) . . .

Superintending Engineer,
Loharu Canal Circle, Rohtak.

The 4th January, 1978

No. 10162-5 Lab-77/26659.—In exercise of the powers conferred under section 88 of the E. S. I. Act 1948, the Governor of Haryana is pleased to exempt the following, Sales/Medical

Representatives of M/s Haryana Dairy Development Corporation, Ambala City from the operation of the E. S. I. Act, 1948 (as amended).

Serial No.	Name of the employee	Designation	Nature of duty	Place of posting with date	Total Emolument	Date from which exemption required
S/Shri						
1.	Pritam Chand	Assistant Milk Procurement Officer	Extension Work	Naraingarh, 29th August, 1973 (Ambala)	482.90	29th August, 1973
2.	Amarjit Singh	Ditto	Ditto	Shahbad, 29th August, 1973 (Kurukshetra)	436.00	Ditto
3.	V. K. Magoo	Ditto	Ditto	Indri, 29th August, 1973 (Karnal)	421.00	Ditto
4.	S. S. Malik	Dairy Extension Assistant	Ditto	Ladwa, 29th August, 1973 (Kurukshetra)	375.90	Ditto
5.	Bansi Lal	Ditto	Ditto	Bilaspur, 13th February, 1974 (Ambala)	363.00	13th February, 1974
6.	Refender Parkash	Ditto	Ditto	Indri, 20th October, 1973 (Karnal)	370.00	20th October, 1973
7.	Ram Singh	Dairy Extension Worker	Ditto	Naraingarh, 29th August, 1973 (Ambala)	279.25	29th August, 1973
8.	Tirth Singh	Ditto	Ditto	Shahbad, 29th August, 1973 (Kurukshetra)	274.00	Ditto
9.	Kiran Singh	Ditto	Ditto	Ladwa, 29th August, 1973 (Kurukshetra)	274.00	Ditto
10.	Anil Kumar	Ditto	Ditto	Nilokheri, 29th August, 1973 (Karnal)	274.00	Ditto
11.	Chander Lal	Ditto	Ditto	Shahbad, 29th August, 1973 (Kurukshetra)	274.00	Ditto
12.	Hoshiar Singh	Ditto	Ditto	Barara, 29th August, 1973 (Ambala)	269.00	Ditto
13.	Suraj Mal	Ditto	Ditto	Umri, 29th August, 1973 (Ambala)	274.00	Ditto
14.	Sat Narain	Ditto	Ditto	Barara, 29th August, 1973 (Ambala)	274.00	Ditto
15.	Himmat Singh	Ditto	Ditto	Nilokheri, 29th August, 1973 (Karnal)	278.75	Ditto
16.	Surmukh Singh	Ditto	Ditto	Lalina, 29th August, 1973 (Ambala)	269.00	Ditto
17.	Nafe Singh	Ditto	Ditto	Indri, 29th August, 1973 (Karnal)	274.00	Ditto
18.	Parshotam Dass	Ditto	Ditto	Keshri, 29th August, 1973 (Ambala)	269.00	Ditto

Serial No.	Name of the employee	Designation	Nature of Duty	Place of posting with date	Total emoluments	Date from which exemption required
Sarvshri						
19.	Sahukar Singh	Dairy Extension Work	Extension Worker	Naraingarh, 29th August, 1973 (Ambala)	269.00	29th August, 1973
20.	Jagir Singh	Ditto	Ditto	Thanachapper, 29th August, 1973 (Ambala)	269.00	Ditto
21.	Devi Dayal	Ditto	Ditto	Naraingash, 29th August, 1973 (Ambala)	269.00	Ditto
22.	Gurnam Singh	Ditto	Ditto	Majri Jattaa, 29th August, 1973 (Ambala)	269.00	Ditto
23.	Surinder Kumar	Ditto	Ditto	Naraingarh, 29th August, 1973 (Ambala)	269.00	Ditto
24.	Mahal Singh	Ditto	Ditto	Gudda 29th August, 1973 (Ambala)	269.03	Ditto
25.	Ramesh Kumar	Ditto	Ditto	Shahbad, 18th October, 1973 (Kurukshetra)	269.00	18th October, 1973
26.	Luxmi Chand	Ditto	Ditto	Naraingarh, 28th November, 1973 (Ambala)	269.00	28th November, 1973
27.	Om Singh	Ditto	Ditto	Naraingarh 5th February, 1974 (Ambala)	228.75	5th February, 1974
28.	Satbir Singh	Ditto	Ditto	Bilaspur, 9th February, 1974 (Ambala)	237.75	9th February, 1974
29.	Tara Chand	Ditto	Ditto	Shahbad 18th March, 1974 (Kurukshetra)	269.00	18th March, 1974
30.	Dhanau Ram	Ditto	Ditto	Thanachappar, 29th August, 1973 (Ambala)	244.00	29th August, 1973

The above exemption is subject to the following conditions : —

- (1) The aforesaid factory/establishment wherein the employees are employed shall maintain a register shown the names and designations of the exempted employees with their present postings and subsequent postings when further renewal exemption is required.
- (2) Notwithstanding this exemption, the employees shall continue to receive such benefit under the said Act to which they might have become entitled to on the basis of the contributions paid prior to the date from which exemption granted by this notification operate;
- (3) The contributions for the exempted period, if already paid, shall not be refunded;
- (4) The employer of the said factory shall submit in respect of the period during which that factory was subject to the operation of the said Act (hereinafter referred to as the said period), such returns in such form and containing such particulars as were due from it in respect of the said period under the Employees State Insurance (General) Regulations, 1950;
- (5) Any Inspector appointed by the Corporation under sub-section (1) of section 45 of the said Act, or other official of the Corporation authorised in this behalf shall, for the purposes of;
 - (i) verifying the particulars contained in any return submitted under sub-section (1) of section 44 for the said period; or
 - (ii) ascertaining whether registers and records were maintained as required by the Employees State Insurance (General) Regulations, 1950 for the said period; or

- (iii) ascertaining whether the employees continue to be entitled to benefits provided by the employer in cash and kind being benefits in consideration of which exemption is being granted under this notification; or
- (iv) ascertaining whether any of the provisions of the Act had been complied with during the period when such provisions were in force in relation to the said factory be empowered to—
 - (a) require the principal or immediate employer to furnish to him such information as he may consider necessary; or
 - (b) enter any factory, establishment, office or other premises occupied by such principal or immediate employer at any reasonable time and require any person found in-charge thereof to produce to such Inspector or other official and allow him to examine such documents, books and other documents relating to the employments or persons and payment of wages or to furnish to him such information as he may consider necessary; or
 - (c) examine the principal or immediate employer, his agent or servant or any person found in such factory, establishment, office or other premises, or any person whom the said Inspector or other official has reasonable cause to believe to have been an employee; or
 - (d) make copies of or take extracts from any register, account book or other documents maintained in such factory, establishment, office or other premises.
- (6) This exemption will remain in operation for the period they are posted at the station where the E. S. I. Scheme is not in force.

The 5th January, 1978

No. 19564-4Lab-77/357.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Maruti Ltd., Gurgaon.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 54 of 1977

between

THE WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S MARUTI LTD., GURGAON

Present—

Shri Vijinder Singh, for the workmen.

Nemo, for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/GG/77/21489, dated 1st June, 1977, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Maruti Ltd., Gurgaon, and its workmen to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of services of the workmen mentioned below was justified and in order ?
If not, to what relief are they entitled ?

(1) Shri Ram Lakhan Patel.

(2) Shri Ram Yash Ram.

(3) Shri Dev Anand Sharma.

(4) Shri Raj Mani.

- (5) Shri Vas Dev Mali.
- (6) Shri Inder Pal Singh.
- (7) Shri L. D. Pasrija.

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties for 21st June, 1977, by registered post but the management did not appear. Again notice was sent to the management by registered post. This notice was served upon the management on 7th June, 1977. The workmen appeared through Shri Vijinder Singh, President of the union. Again notice to the management was sent by registered post for 25th July, 1977. It was also served on the management on 20th July, 1977, but the management even did not appear, hence *ex parte* proceedings against the management were ordered and the case was set for filing claim statement by the workmen for 30th July, 1977. On 30th July, 1977, it was disclosed that some death had taken place in the family of the representative of the workmen. One Shri Suresh Chand Misra appeared and prayed for adjournment, the case was adjourned for filing claim statement by the workmen. On 5th August, 1977, the workmen filed claim statement. Thereafter the workmen did not appear on the adjourned date. Notice was issued to the workmen. Workmen appeared through the said Shri Vijinder Pal Singh. He prayed for adjournment for the evidence of the workmen. The case was fixed for the evidence of the workmen on 8th December, 1977. The workmen examined one Shri Ram Yash Ram, the concerned workman and the said Shri Vijinder Singh. Shri Ram Yash Ram deposed that he was appointed on 10th September, 1975, on wages of Rs. 160 per mensem. The management demanded resignation from him. He was a member of the union, he did not give resignation. Then the management called the Chowkidar on the gate of the factory and snatched away his card and pushed the workman out of the gate. He further deposed that he was jobless by this time in spite of his efforts to get some work. Shri Vijinder Singh deposed that the management behaved in the same way with another workman concerned Shri L.D. Pasrija as they behaved with Shri Ram Yash Ram. He produced written complaints Ex. W-1 to W-4 and also produced a report Ex. 5. He further deposed that all the workmen concerned were turned out of the factory and were behaved in wrong manner and that all the workmen concerned were unemployed and then the workmen closed their case.

I have considered the evidence of the workmen oral as well as documentary. Ex. W-1 is the complaint of Shri Ram Lakhan Pal the workman concerned Ex. W-3 from the workman concerned Shri Raj Mani, Ex. W-1 states that on 2nd May, 1977, the Personnel Manager of the factory asked him to resign, threatening him that he should not allow entry to the workman nor shall pay his dues, if the workman did not resign. Ex. W-2 reads that the Personnel department himself wrote his resignation and began to pay his dues which he refused to receive, then he was threatened that he shall remain out of the gate and nor shall get his dues. On the next date the workman went on his duty, he was not taken on duty but was paid a sum of Rs. 145. Ex. W-3 reads that he was ill and had sent his medical certificate together with fitness certificate. He demanded duty from the management but the management took away his card and tried to pay his dues forcibly which he did not receive. Ex. W-4 reads that the management had been pressing the workman concerned to resign. He had gone on leave for six days but when he reported back for duty, the management refused to mark his attendance and did not allow him to join his duty. Ex. W-5 is a copy of some news item of Nav Bharat Times, dated 5th May, 1977, which reads that the management was contravening the Industrial Disputes Amendment Act, 1971, knowingly. This news item is based on the opinion of one Shri D. Panday, the Deputy Labour Commissioner (Centre).

From the *ex parte* evidence of the workmen, I am satisfied that the termination of services of the concerned workmen was not justified, neither in order. I, therefore, give my award as follows :—

That the termination of services of the workmen mentioned below was neither justified nor in order. They are entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service and with full back wages :—

- (1) Shri Ram Lakhan Patel.
- (2) Shri Ram Yash Ram.
- (3) Shri Dev Anand Sharma.
- (4) Shri Raj Mani.
- (5) Shri Vas Dev Mali.
- (6) Shri Inder Pal Singh.
- (7) Shri L. D. Pasrija

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad,

The 10th December, 1977.

No. 1205, dated the 20th December, 1977

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment, Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated the 20th December, 1977.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 19001-4Lab-77/359.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Lone Star Engineering Industries Private Ltd., 16/4 Mathura Road, Old Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 182 of 1976

between

SHRI PARBHAKAR KAUSHIK WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S LONE STAR
ENGINEERING INDUSTRIES PRIVATE LIMITED, 16/4, MATHURA ROAD,
OLD FARIDABAD

Present :

Shri Pasham Singh for the workman.

Nemo for the management.

AWARD

(1) By order No. ID/FD/1054-B-76/32812, dated 2nd September, 1976, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Lone Star Engineering Industries Private Limited, 16/4, Mathura Road, Old Faridabad and its workman Shri Parbhakar Kaushik this to Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

(2) Whether the termination of services of Shri Parbhakar Kaushik was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

(3) On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The workman appeared and filed his claim statement. The case was fixed for filing written statement by the management on 10th January, 1977 directing the workman to file his claim statement on 31st December, 1976 and to send its copies to the management. On 10th January, 1977 the workman appeared but none appeared for the management. The case fixed for *ex parte* evidence of the workman. The workman examined himself and stated that he was appointed on 3rd December, 1975 as a helper and his services were terminated on 1st July, 1976 on the ground that the management had no post for his work. He stated that the management had the post for work but employed any other person. He was neither given notice pay. He attended the factory gate for 7/8 days but he was not taken on duty. He raised the demand. He further stated that he was neither given any charge sheet nor any warning and he was still un-employed.

(4) I have considered the *ex-parte* evidence of the workman which consists of his own statement only. It is evidence from his statement that he had less than 5 months service at his credit. It is a general rule which finds place in model standing orders as well as in certified standing orders that the workman is not confirmed prior to six months. From the statement of the workman I find that he had less than 5 months service at his credit. He was not confirmed. The workman has even not stated that he was a probationer nor he has filed any letter of appointment containing terms of his employment. In the circumstances, it is probable that his services might be of temporary nature. In these circumstances, I am not in a position to hold that the termination of services of the workman concerned was illegal and unjustified.

(5) From the above conclusion drawn by me and from a consideration of the statement of the workman concerned, I have to hold that the termination of the workman concerned Shri Parbhakar Kaushik

was justified and in order. He is not entitled to any relief. The award has been given herein above in para No. 5 hereof.

Dated the 28th November, 1977.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 1153, dated 30th November, 1977

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated the 30th November, 1977.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 19005-4Lab-77/361. —In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Snowtamp Engineering Company Limited, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No 72 of. 1977
between

SHRI RADHEY LAL WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S SNOWTAMP
ENGINEERING COMPANY LIMITED, FARIDABAD

Present :

Nemo for the workman.

Shri S. L. Gupta for the management:

AWARD

By order No.ID/FD/1038-C-77/22656, dated 9th June, 1977; the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Snowtamp Engineering Company Limited, Faridabad and its workman Shri Radhe Lal to this Tribunal, for adjudication; in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Radhey Lal was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt the order of reference notices were issued to the parties. The workman did not appear but the representative for the management appeared. The representative for the management stated that the workman has been reinstated with full back wages and is working in the factory. I, therefore, give my award as follows :—

That the termination of services of Shri Radhey Lal was neither justified nor in order. He is entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service and full back wages, which the representative for the management stated that the management had already done.

Dated the 1st December, 1977.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 1162, dated the 1st December, 1977

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated the 1st December, 1977.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.